

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

Another Response to the Feeble Doubts of Amjad Rafeeq

Allah, The Most High, said:

فَسْتَذْكُرُونَ مَا أَقُولُ لَكُمْ وَأَفْوضُ أَمْرِي
إِلَى اللَّهِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ بِصِيرٍ بِالْعِبَادِ

"And you will remember what I am telling you, and my affair I leave it to Allâh. Verily, Allâh is the All-Seer of (His) slaves." (Ghafir 40:44)

Amjad Rafeeq stated:

‘... We see that al-Haafidh al-Hakamee gave a linguistic definition of eemaan and stated it is tasdeeq. Then he gave a shar’iyy definition of eemaan with the Salaf (actions are from eemaan and eemaan is belief, speech and action)...’

The criticisms of scholars who have criticized the Asha’ris and those were polluted with some of their ideologies regarding their definition of eeman in the language as being only tasdeeq was generally because they (the Ash’aris and their likes) intended to use it as a means to define the shar’ee meaning of eeman to be only tasdeeq of what the Prophet, alayhi as-salaatu was salaam came with.

As Shaykhul Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy upon him, said:

“The eleven sect of the Murji’ah: the companions of Bishr al-Mureesi say ‘that eeman is at-tasdeeq because al-eeman in the language is a tasdeeq and whatever is not tasdeeq is not eeman’ and they allege that at-tasdeeq is in the heart and through the tongue together...”¹

Al-Haafidh Ibn Hajar (d. 853H) said, “Eemaan in the language means ‘tasdeeq’ (attesting to the truth of something). In the Sharee’ah it means ‘tasdeeq’ (attesting to the truth) of what the Messenger (swallAllaahu alaihi wasallam) brought from his Lord...”

¹ Al-Eeman al-Awsat, page 91, print al-Jazaai’riyyah.

Whereas if we are to read the speech of Ibn Hajar once again we will notice the pattern and connection between the definition of eeman in the language and the definition of the shar'eeah because Ibn Hajar incorrectly built his sharee'ah meaning of eeman based upon his definition of eeman in the language, therefore this erroneous quote of Ibn Hajar was criticized mostly from this angle.

As for the statement of al-Haafidh al-Hakamee, may Allah have mercy upon him,

Then Ash-Shaykh Saalih as-Suhaymee, may Allah preserve him, said when explaining the speech of al-Haafidh al-Hakamee:

“...He (i.e.al-Haafidh al-Hakamee) added to the definition al-Iqraar (submissive type of affirmation) for verily eeman in the language is not limited to at-tasdeeq, eeman in the language is not limited to at-tasdeeq. For verily eeman comprises of at-tasdeeq along with al-Iqraa (submissive type of affirmation) even in the language it comprises of tasdeeq and more .So generally expressing (i.e. eeman) as a tasdeeq only then it is a deficient expression with the proof that eeman essentially corresponds with disbelief and tasdeeq corresponds with taktheeb (denial)...”

He, may Allah preserve him, then said:

“...Indeed Shaykhul Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah has debated with those who limit al-eeman to tasdeeq in the language and refuted them from sixteen angles, so return back to it in chapter seven of the Fataawaa of the checking of Naasir...”²

So this happens when you rely upon your own understanding Oh Amjad; from here I encourage Amjad Rafeeq and his colleagues of Spubs to come out and seek knowledge and to stop pretending to be people of knowledge.

This also shows that Amjad is willing to call to taqleed; blind following in order to divert and hinder the public from reading the criticisms of the scholars regarding the erroneous quote of Ibn Hajar.

However if Amjad were to find a scholar from Ahlus-Sunnah who defines eeman in the language as tasdeeq whilst not using it as a means to define the sharee'ah meaning as only tasdeeq of what the Prophet came with then he should not try to use it to justify Ibn Hajar's mistake, based upon the imperative factor why Ibn Hajar was considered mistaken was due to it being a cause for him building his sharee'ah meaning upon it.

² Reference: in audio form [here](#).

Ash-Shaykh al-Uthaymeen, may Allah have mercy upon him, defined eeman in the language as tasdeeq, as found in his explanation of the three fundamentals, whilst he defined the sharee'ah meaning as 'belief of the heart and statement of the tongue, and actions of the limbs' then on the footnote of this aforementioned quote of Ash-Shaykh al-Uthaymeen it was stated:

"This which the Shaykh mentioned here, perhaps he has retracted from this afterwards and then mentioned that the definition of eeman in the language as tasdeeq is a deficient definition... he (i.e. the Shaykh) said if eeman was defined as al-Iqraa (submissive type of affirmation) it would have been better, therefore we say eeman is al-iqraa and there is no iqraa (submissive type of affirmation) except through a tasdeeq..."³

Whereas Ash-Shaykh al-Uthaymeen, may Allah have mercy upon him, also said:

"And eeman in the language is al-Iqraa and confession which necessitates acceptance and submission which coordinates with the meaning of the sharee'ah and as for their statement 'eeman in the language is a tasdeeq then its erroneous... that has been mentioned by Shaykhul Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy upon him, in detail in his book 'Book of Eeman'".⁴

Al-Imaam an-Nawawee, may Allah have mercy upon him mentioned when quoting on some of the scholars:

"... If it is within the language of the Arabs that one is called a believer through a tasdeeq then that is not worthy (to be applied) in the speech of Allah..."⁵

So using the linguistic meaning of eeman as tasdeeq to establish the erroneous definition of eeman in the sharee'ah as a tasdeeq of what the Prophet, alayhi as-salaatu was-salaam, came with, as Ibn Hajar did then that is from the belief of the ash'aris.

Also Amjad is so upset and disturbed for me saying that 'he has propagated the belief of the Ash'ariyyah whether he done it deliberately or out of mere ignorance'

Whereas this statement of mine is correct from two angles:

The first angle: is from the meaning of propagation in the English language:

³ Footnote of Sharh Usool ath-Thaalathah, 129, print: U'baad ar-Rahmaan.

⁴ Reference: Sharh of Forty Hadith, page 56, print: Daarul ad-Diyaa.

⁵ Reference: Sharhu Saheeh Muslim (1/2) page 103, print daarul Ma'reefah.

‘The process of spreading to a larger area or greater number; dissemination. The spreading of something (a belief or practice) into new regions.’

So let’s see if that definition applies to what Amjad has done:

Has Amjad spread the erroneous quote of Ibn Hajar via publishing and distribution to the midst of common folks, the answer is yes!

So with no doubt that is considered to be propagation, whether he done it deliberately or out of mere ignorance.

The second angle: Based upon what he has spread.

This is what Amjad has spread:

Al-Haafidh Ibn Hajar (d. 853H) said, “Eemaan in the language means ‘tasdeeq’ (attesting to the truth of something). In the Sharee’ah it means ‘tasdeeq’ (attesting to the truth) of what the Messenger (swallAllaahu alaihi wasallam) brought from his Lord...”

Ash-Shaykh Saleh al-Fawzaan, may Allaah preserve him, said in his book *Masaailul-Eeman*: Clarifying the types of the *Murji’ah* “The second type: They are those who say that *Eeman* is only *tasdeeq* of the heart, and this is the saying of the *Ashaa’irah*. This is also a *baatil* (false) statement since the *Kuffaar* have attestation of the heart, they knew that the Qur’aan is true and that the Messenger (*sallallaahu ‘alaihi wasallam*) is true, and the Jews and Christians knew that.

الَّذِينَ آتَيْنَاهُمُ الْكِتَابَ يَعْرِفُونَهُ كَمَا يَعْرِفُونَ أَبْنَاءَهُمْ وَإِنَّ فَرِيقًا مِنْهُمْ لَيَكْتُمُونَ الْحَقَّ وَهُمْ يَعْلَمُونَ (١٤٦)

Those to whom we gave the Scripture (Jews and Christians) recognize him (Muhammad *sallallaahu ‘alaihi wasallam*) as they recognize their sons. But verily, a party of them conceal the Truth while they know it.”⁶

Ash-Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan, may Allah preserve him, said:

“... We say *eeman* is not only a *tasdeeq* as the notice upon it has been proceeded”⁷

The author of *al-Eeman baynas-Salaf wal-Mutakallimeen* stated in the chapter entitled ‘*Haqeeqatul-Eeman ‘indal-Ashaa’irah* (Reality of *Eeman* with the *Ashaa’irah*): The majority of the *Ashaa’irah* in this state that *Eeman* in the *Shar’* is one and is indivisible, and it is *at-tasdeeq*

⁶ <http://www.dawahfromyemen.info/pdfs/hadiya.pdf>

⁷ “A clarification of some of the errors of the authors” .page 57 from the library program ‘shamela’.

of Allaah (the Most High) and of the prophethood (of Muhammad *sallallahu 'alaihi wasallam*) and other than that. *Eeman* according to them is *tasdeeq* of the heart only. This is the *madhhab* that is well known with them.”⁸

Ash-Shaykh Muhammad al-Amaan al-Jaami, may Allah have mercy upon him, said:

“...rather *eeman* is either only a *tasdeeq* or at-*tasdeeq* along with al-*Iqraa*; this (belief) is what most of the *Asha'ris* upon...”⁹

Amjad Rafeeq stated:

‘...It would be useful for the reader to refer to POINT 10 in the very first post in this thread which explains how the faajir kadhhaab's tongue started wagging and how he got prematurely excited just because al-Shibal said that to define *eemaan* as *tasdeeq* is "the saying of the *Ash'aris*" not realizing that al-Shibal is speaking here of an error in the language,...’

This speech of Amjad is wrong from many angles from them:

1: If al-Shibal was merely speaking about it being an error in the language he would not have mentioned it in a book entitled ‘...the Mistakes in ‘Aqeedah of the book *Fat-hul Baari*’

2: al-Shibal would have not connected his correction of the erroneous quote of Ibn Hajar upon what Shaykhul Islaam brought to notice, as al-Shibal stated ‘...and Abul Abbaas Ibn Taymiyyah has brought this to notice in his book *al-Eeman al-Kabeer* (293/289/7) within his *fataawaa*...”

3: He would have not mentioned that it is the opinion of the *asha'ris* if it was just a mere error in the language.

4: How can it be a mere error in the language while some of the deviant sects built their corrupted belief of *eeman* upon this deficient definition of *eeman*.

5: That this definition of *eeman* in the language as a *tasdeeq* is deficient as you mentioned Oh Amjad where you said:

‘...Linguistically, he defined *eemaan* deficiently (as *tasdeeq*) which is something the *Ash'aris* also do, and thus it can be said that this linguistic definition is a saying of the *Ash'aris*...’

⁸ <http://www.dawahfromyemen.info/pdfs/hadiya.pdf>

⁹ Sharh of *Usool ath-Thaalathah*, page 39, print :Markaz al-hadhramee.

Amjad Rafeeq stated when quoting on Ibn Hajar:

والجامع بين الآية والحديث: أن الأعمال مع انضمامها إلى التصديق داخلة في معنى البر، كما هي داخلة في معنى الإيمان

And the combining of the verse (2:177) and the hadeeth ("eemaan is seventy-odd branches") together affords that actions (a'maal) being augmented (added) to tasdeeq enter into the meaning (musammaa) of al-birr, just as they enter into the meaning (musammaa) of eemaan. (al-Fath 1/50-51)

Here Ibn Hajar clearly supports the position of Ahl al-Sunnah that all the actions (a'maal) enter into the musammaa (meaning) of eemaan, along with tasdeeq.

So we take from this that Amjad Rafeeq sees that if Ibn Hajar affirms that actions enter in the meaning of eeman whilst saying it is a condition of the completeness of eeman that this stance is supporting the position of Ahlus Sunnah by that.

Let's see if Amjad's understanding is correct:

Ash-Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan, may Allah preserve him, was asked the following question:

Question: There are some who say: 'eeman is statements and belief and actions however the actions are a condition for completeness within it (i.e. eeman)' and he also says 'I do not make a ruling of takfeer except by al-I'tiqaad... so is this statement from the statements of the people of the Sunnah or not?

Answer: The one who says this did not understand al-eeman nor did he understand al'aqeedah and this is what we said in the answer to the previous question: It is compulsory upon him to study al'aqeedah from the people of knowledge and to take it from its correct sources and then he will come to know the answer to this question. **His statement 'verily eeman is statements and actions and belief... then says indeed the actions are a condition of the completeness of eeman or of the correctness of eeman this is a contradiction!! How is the actions from eeman then he says the actions are a condition** and it's well-known that a condition is of what is external of that which it is a condition for so this is a contradiction. This (i.e. person) desires to combine between the saying of the Salaf and the saying of the of those who came after them while he does not understand the contradiction (within this) because he does not know the saying of the Salaf and does not know the reality of the statement of those who came after them, whereas he wanted to combine both together..al-eeman is statements and actions and belief, the actions are from eeman and it is eeman and it is not a condition from the conditions of eeman or a condition of completeness or other than that from the statements which are currently being propagated now. So al-Eeman is a

saying with the tongue and a belief of the heart and actions of the limbs and it increases through obedience and decreases by disobedience.¹⁰

Ash-Shaykh ‘Abdul-‘Azeez Ar-Raajihi, may Allaah preserve him, was asked: “There are those who say ‘Eeman is statement, action and belief but actions from the *shart kamaal* (condition of completeness) of it’?” He replied: **“These statements are not from the statements of Ahlus-Sunnah. Ahlus-Sunnah** say that *eeman* is statement of the tongue, statement of the heart and actions of the limbs and actions of the heart. And from the statements of them (Ahlus-Sunnah) is: *eeman* is statement and actions, and from their statements is: *eeman* is statement, action and intention. So *eeman* must have the following four matters: Statement of the tongue, i.e. to utter it upon the tongue; statement of the heart, i.e. to accept and affirm it; and action of the heart, i.e. intention and sincerity; action of the limbs. Actions are from the portions of *eeman*. It is not to be said that action is *shart kamaal* or it is a necessities of it, for these are the statements of the *murjiah*. And we do not know that Ahlus-Sunnah state that actions are *shart kamaal*.” (Ijmaa’ al-‘Ulamah al-A’laam ‘alaa annal-‘amal rukun fil-eeman)¹¹

Amjad stated when explaining the statement of al-Haafidh al-Hakamee:

“... then he contrasted between the position of the Salaf and that of the Mu'tazilah by using the terms "shart kamaal" and "shart sihhah". The only difference between his statements and that of Ibn Hajar is that Ibn Hajar made the erroneous generalization for both the Salaf (all actions are shart kamaal) and the Mu'tazilah (all actions are shart sihhah).”

First of all: ash-Shaykh Saalih as-Suhaymeen said when explaining the statements of al-Haafidh that it is more correct to use the wording ‘pillar’ than ‘condition’.¹²

Secondly: Amjad does not understand the imperative factor that saying that actions are a condition of the completeness of *eeman* has not been uttered by the Salaf as-Saalih as ash-Shaykh al-Barraak said when criticizing the erroneous quote of Ibn Hajar which Amjad spread to the public, where ash-Shaykh al-Baraak, said:

¹⁰ <http://aloloom.net/vb/archive/index.php/t-6628.html>

¹¹ <http://www.dawahfromyemen.info/pdfs/hadiya.pdf>

¹² Reference: in audio form [here](#).

“... I do not know of anyone from the *Imaams* of the *Salaf* who expressed the term that the actions are a condition or not a condition for the correctness of *eeman* or either it being a condition of its completeness.”¹³

So it becomes more and more clear that the issue is not just merely erroneous generalization but rather what it is built upon this, is that Ibn Hajar does not see actions necessary for eeman however he sees it to be from eeman from the angle that it completes eeman.

Shaykhul Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy upon him, said:

“The Fuqahaa of the Murji’ah stated ‘al-eeman is tasdeeq of the heart and a statement of the tongue and that actions are not from it (from this angle) whereas they make actions a fruit of eeman and that which is necessitated by its means of which caused (it) while they do not make it (i.e. actions) something necessary for it (i.e. eeman).’¹⁴

Also Ash-Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan, may Allaah preserve him, said when clarifying the belief of the *fuqahaa* of the *Murji’ah*:

“... As for actions then they say ‘it does not enter upon the essence of *eeman* however it is a condition (of its completeness) or it (i.e. actions) is that which completes *eeman*’ and due to that they were called the *Murji’ah*... ”¹⁵

Some of the heads of the *Murjiah* agreed with the *Salaf* in speech that *Eeman* is belief, statement and action yet still did not free them from the ‘*aqeedah* of the *Murjiah*!

From them:

Al-Qhazaali said: “It is well known from the *Salaf* that: *eemaan* is conviction, statement and action. So what is the meaning of this? **It is not far off that actions are considered from *eeman* because it (actions) perfects it (*eemaan*) and completes it.**” (*Qawaaidul-‘Aqaaid/ Page 258*)¹⁶

¹³ Reference: ‘The Commentary of Shaykh al-Barraak upon the Aqeedah mistakes of the book *Fat-hul Baari*’ page: five.

¹⁴ Reference: at-Tuhfatul al-Iraaqiyyah page 167, print: ar-Rushd.

¹⁵ Series of Sharh of treatises (33) print: Daarul Imaam Ahmad.

¹⁶ <http://www.dawahfromyemen.info/pdfs/hadiya.pdf>

Allah, The Most High said:

ونصحت لكم لكن لا تحبون الناصحين

“And I have given you good advice but you like not good advisers.”(al-Aaraaf,79)

Lastly I have asked some of the shuyookh of Yemen regarding the persistence of Amjad upon his errors, so they advised that he should be warned from and that we should continue to openly clarify his errors in order that the public is not deceived by him^{17, 18}

By: Abu Fajr Abdul Fattaah bin U’thmaan, as-Somaalee.

Date: March 12, 2012¹⁹

¹⁷ <http://aloloom.net/vb/showthread.php?t=11902&p=50255#post50255>

¹⁸ **Also we should not be fooled by Amjad pretending to respond to these words of advice by bringing irrelevant speech to the topic of debate, whereas it is only a mere way of throwing ashes in the eyes of the readers to distract them from realizing his (i.e. Amjad’s) mistakes.**

¹⁹ <http://www.dawahfromyemen.info/pdfs/rftationofamjadrafeeq.pdf>

Appendix (1)

A response to one of the accusations of Amjad Rafeeq

Majid Jawed Al Afghanee wrote:

I wanted to clarify regarding the new accusation on abu fajr that he did not quote from Shaykh Uthaymeens book properly rather it was not his mistake it was my mistake but it was not done deliberately

I was the one who sent Abu Fajr the qoute from Shaykh Uthaymeen rahimullah and I took it directly from the book but when I sent it to him I sent him the two lines that were translated without clarifying that it was not a full sentence together

rather it is "and there statement

الايمان في اللغة التصديق ففيه نظر

then the shaykh has some speech but after that speech he says and we say...

الايمان المستلزم للقبول و الادعاء احترازا

and due to the fact I sent it to Abu Fajr, anyone who sends something to those who trust them will use that speech as is well known but it was mistake on my part for not clarifying to the brother Abu Fajr

and Allah Knows best

- Majid Jawed Al Afghanee

<http://aloloom.net/vb/showthread.php?t=11902&p=50255#post50255>

Appendix (2)

Another Response to one of Amjad Rafeeqs accusations

Amjad Rafeeq propagates more false accusations based upon unidentified characters by only referring to them as ‘a brother’, so please tell us Oh Amjad who is this so called ‘brother’. Whilst Amjad makes it a series of unidentified characters whereas the first so called unidentified character who was described as ‘a brother’ narrates on another unidentified character as he described him ‘from one of our brothers’, what is this!!!

So Oh Amjad do you expect that the public are going to accept your accusations built upon unknown people to them, this comes to show that Amjad is desperately willing to try anyway means he can find to save his reputation even if it takes going against the principle of the Salaf:

‘Name your men (narrators)’

However this unidentified person said:

“... The thing I was searching for was the translation of a saying of Ibn Taymeeyah. It turned out that he had also used it by copying it directly from another website without checking its translation or its context and then used it in his refutation of SPUBS...”

Alhamdulillah as the saying goes:

من أقال فقد برئ

Whosoever references (his reports) is indeed free from blame

So I clearly made my reference apparent when narrating the quote of Ibn Taymiyyah, whereas I said when mentioning the quote of Ibn Taymiyyah:

‘Taken from: <http://aa.trinimuslms.com/showthread.php?t=8629>’

Whereas it is a post of one of the former administrators of the aforementioned website, who is a graduate of the University of Madeenah. So if he were to be mistaken in his post or translation than I am not to blame because I only took from what was apparent that his

translations are mostly accurate.

Therefore if you wish to advise the aforementioned brother regarding his post then all you had to do was to privately contact him about it than trying to expose him publicly.

Also Oh Amjad Rafeeq if you wish for your accusations to be accepted, I suggest that you start off by naming your men!!!1

Written by: Abu Fajr 'Abdul-Fattaah